

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 * * * * *

9 FRANK ORTIZ,)
10 vs. Plaintiff,) 3:05-cv-00113-LRH-VPC
11 DAVID KELLY, et al.,) ORDER
12 Defendants.)
13)
14)

15 Before the court is Plaintiff's Objection to Magistrate Judge Cooke's Denial of Docket
16 Document No. 97 (#102¹), which the court will treat as a motion to reconsider Magistrate's Order
17 #99.

18 The Court has conducted its review in this case, has fully considered the Plaintiff's
19 motion, and other relevant matters of record pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b) (1), and concludes
20 that the Magistrate Judge's ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law.

21 The Magistrate Judge's Order (#99) will, therefore, be sustained and Plaintiff's motion
22 (#102) is denied.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 DATED this 5th day of December, 2007.



25
26 LARRY R. HICKS
27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28

¹Refers to this court's docket number.